



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/951,630	10/16/1997	ARLENE M VANCE	07099.0010-0	1804

7590 08/27/2003
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER
1300I STREET N W
WASHINGTON, DC 200053315

EXAMINER

POINVIL, FRANTZY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

08/951,630

Applicant(s)

VANCE ET AL.

Examin r

Frantzy Poinvil

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 99-114 and 166-212 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 99-102 and 198-199 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al (US Patent No. 4,449,186) and Dettelbach et al (US Patent No. 5,253,166).

As per claims 99-102 and 198-199, Kelly et al disclose a self-ticketing system for booking a reservation for a traveler. The system comprises storing in a database a set of future trip records associated with a traveler and reflecting a travel itinerary. Note column 106, lines 25-29. Kelly et al disclose that a customer inserts a magnetic card onto a terminal which identifies the customer and which automatically displays travel data associated with the customer. Note column 103, lines 34-45. The customer then selects the appropriate flight information or trip record and inserts a traveling date desired to travel. Note column 104, lines 49-57 of Kelly et al. Kelly et al do not explicitly teach the trip records are past or frequent trip records. This is taught by Dettelbach et al. Dettelbach et al disclose a travel reservation system having means for storing customer travel data and past trip data for future usage. See column 3, lines 35-45 of Dettelbach et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 3628

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelly et al with Dettelbach et al in order to automatically book a traveler's trip based on their prior trip records. The motivation would have been to avoid inserting redundant information related to a particular traveler thereby facilitating a faster customer service time.

3. Claims 102-112 and 166-212 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al as applied to claims 99 and 198 above, and further in view of Shoolery et al..

As per claims 103-112, 179-184 and 210-212, the teachings of Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al are discussed. The combination of Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al does not explicitly teach providing an expense report and populating fields in regard to an expense report. Shoolery et al disclose a travel system and a computer implemented method of managing information in a travel system comprising storing travel information corresponding itineraries and associated expense data, travel policy data in a storage subsystem. The system comprises various databases and forms, which must include populating fields for entering and inputting information therein. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Shoolery et al with Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al in order to monitor employees compliance with an organization's travel policy.

As per claims 166-178, the teachings of Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al are discussed above. The combined teachings fails to explicitly teach restrictions on travel reservations. These teachings are taught by Shoolery et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate travel restriction data into Kelly et al and

Art Unit: 3628

Dettélbach et al in order monitor employees compliance regarding an organization's travel policies and regulations.

As per claims 185-197 and 200-206, Kelly et al disclose prompting a traveler to input a flight number and/or a date of travel. Note column 104, lines 49-51. It is noted that Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al are directed to a computerized reservation system but fail to teach the various obvious steps of displaying necessary information to the user, identifying a beginning, an ending date of a travel reservation and a travel duration. The Examiner notes that these are common entries in booking a travel reservation that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in the system of Kelly et al in order to complete a travel reservation for a traveler.

As per claims 207-209, the combination of Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al. does not explicitly indicate predetermined policies governing travel associated with an entity. These teachings are taught by Shoolery et al. Shoolery et al discloses a corporate travel system having a computerized system comprising a travel planning, expense reporting and travel management system. The system further comprises approval of travel requests before travel expenses are occurred, an automated expense report approval and the planning and booking of air, hotel and car accommodations. Note column 7 to column 8 of Shoolery et al. Corporate and traveler policies are discussed on column 2 and column 8 of Shoolery et al. Having a travel planning and expense reports as taught by Shoolery et al would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the combination of Dettelbach et al and Kelly et al. in order to monitor employees' travel expenses for abuses and or fraud.

Art Unit: 3628

4. Claims 113-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al as applied to claim 99 above, and further in view of Kahl et al (US Patent No. 5,936,625).

As per claims 113-114, the teachings of Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al are discussed above. The combination of Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al fails to teach or suggest a calendar showing at least one month divided into days having multiple icons associated with a day. Kahl et al teach a calendar showing at least one month divided into days having multiple icons associated with a day. See figures 2, 5 and 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Kahl et al into Kelly et al and Dettelbach et al. in order to show a traveler's travel planning and related expense reports.

Conclusion


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantzy Poinvil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00AM-5:30PM.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

FP

August 21, 2003


FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
44 3628